_
×
v

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/628,569	HABER, JEFF	
Notice of Allowability	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Joseph Rudy	3627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperature All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RI of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313	(OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this app or other appropriate communication GHTS. This application is subject to	olication. If not includ will be mailed in due	ed course. <b>THIS</b>
1. This communication is responsive to <u>04 April 2005 Amenda</u>	<u>ment</u> .		
2. The allowed claim(s) is/are <u>1-20</u> .			
3. $\boxtimes$ The drawings filed on <u>31 July 2001</u> are accepted by the Ex	aminer.		
4. Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority una) All b) Some* c) None of the:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * Certified copies not received:  Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONM THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.  5. A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be subminsformal pattern APPLICATION (PTO-152) which give 6. CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must (a) including changes required by the Notice of Draftspers 1) hereto or 2) to Paper No./Mail Date  (b) including changes required by the attached Examiner's Paper No./Mail Date  Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1. each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in time.  7. DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the depositation of the priority of the priority of the priority documents and priority documents.	been received.  been received in Application No cuments have been received in this r  of this communication to file a reply of ENT of this application.  itted. Note the attached EXAMINER' as reason(s) why the oath or declarate the submitted.  son's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-S) as Amendment / Comment or in the O  84(c)) should be written on the drawing the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(c) sit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL m	national stage applicational stage applicational stage application of the front (not the d).	quirements OTICE OF
Attachment(s)  1. Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2. Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3. Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No./Mail Date  4. Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material	5. ☐ Notice of Informal Pa 6. ☐ Interview Summary Paper No./Mail Date 8), 7. ☑ Examiner's Amendm 8. ☑ Examiner's Stateme 9. ☐ Other	(PTO-413), e nent/Comment	,

7. Applicant's April 4, 2005 REMARKS have been reviewed. Applicant's counsel's statement regarding the February 22, 2005 Interview is not complete. Another USPTO person, Mr. Vincent Millin, SPE AU 3624, was present during the interview. The presence of Mr. Millin was conveyed to Mr. Carr on numerous occassions prior to the beginning of the February 22, 2005 Interview. Further, Mr. Millin openly participated in the Interview.

Applicant's Affidavit received April 4, 2005 has been reviewed. The Affadavit is not convincing with regards to overcoming the filing date of Collins-Rector et al., 6,188,398. First, paragraph 7 of the Affadavit recites "By the end of June, 1999, I had a fully developed and working model of the interactive website designed . . ." This statement establishes a date after the June 2, 1999 filing date of Collins-Rector. Thus, it does overcome the filing date of Collins-Rector. The previous 6 paragraphs of the Affidavit do not establish a reduction to practice prior to Collins-Rector's filing date. Regarding paragraphs 4 & 5 of the April 4, 2005 Affadavit, no publication to the public is culled from these statements, given the Confidentiality Non-Disclosure Agreement between CBS and Mr. Katz, included with the April 4, 2005 Affadavit.

8. Applicant's April 4, 2005 REMARKS regarding the appropriateness of the February 4, 2005 Final Rejection have been reviewed. Applicant's April 4, 2005 REMARKS are clear as to providing a line of demarcation over the Collins-Rector and Kaman, US 6,229,541, rejection used in the February 4, 2005 Final Rejection. Applicant's April 4, 2005 REMARKS are convincing and provide proper reasoning for the allowance of the present Application.

Andrew Joseph Rudy Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3627

571-272-6789